

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of December 31, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 6-8, 12-13, 24-26 and 30 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-5, 9-11, 14-23, 27-29 and 31-38 are presented for examination upon entry of the present paper. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 9-11, 19-20, 27-29, 31, and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,895,251 B2 to Soh et al. (“Soh”) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,975,988 B1 to Roth et al. (“Roth”). Claims 3-5 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soh and Roth, and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,678,361 B2 to Rooke et al. (“Rooke”). Claims 14-18 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soh and Roth, and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2002/0077135 A1 to Hyon (“Hyon”). These rejections are traversed below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “synthesizing from the text message a synthesized voice signal, *altering said synthesized voice signal based on meta-information included with the received text message*, [and] generating video content having an animated image as an image of a character that pronounces the *altered* synthesized voice signal.” Written description support for the amended features can be found in the originally filed specification when read as a whole, and for example, at page 16, lines 1-3 and page 18, lines 1-9.¹

The Office Action at page 3 correctly indicates that Soh fails to describe features related to synthesizing from a text message a synthesized voice signal, and generating a video content having an animated image as an image of a character that pronounces the synthesized voice signal.

¹ The referenced passages may be cross-referenced to the instant application publication, US 2006/0019636, at paragraphs [0086] and [0103], respectively.

The Office Action at page 3 relies on Roth at col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 6 to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Soh described above. In particular, the Office Action at page 3 contends that Roth at col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 6 describes features related to synthesizing from a text message a synthesized voice signal, and generating video content having an animated image as an image of a character that pronounces the synthesized voice signal.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the cited passage of Roth (or any passage of Roth, for that matter) may appropriately be analogized to features related to synthesizing from a text message a synthesized voice signal, and generating video content having an animated image as an image of a character that pronounces the synthesized voice signal, Roth fails to describe altering the synthesized voice signal based on meta-information included with the received text message, much less generating video content having an animated image as an image of a character that pronounces the altered synthesized voice signal as recited in amended claim 1. More specifically, Roth at col. 8, line 45 – col. 9, line 57 describes sound effect processes wherein sound effects to be applied to a multi-media image or video component are recorded and are stored in an audio database 358, accessed from some other database, or are recorded into a local storage of a local user interface device 120. As such, Roth fails to describe features related to altering a synthesized voice signal based on meta-information included with a received text message. In contrast Roth describes achieving sound effects by way of storing different versions or variants of recordings.

Notwithstanding whether a combination of Soh and Roth is proper, the combination fails to result in at least the above-noted features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Amended independent claim 19 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. As such, claim 19 is allowable for at least reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims because none of the additional applied references (e.g., Rooke and Hyon) remedy the deficiencies of Soh and Roth described above (notwithstanding whether a combination of the applied references is proper).

For example, claim 38 recites “a converter module for selecting the animated image, wherein the text message from the sender terminal does not specify the animated image.”

The Office Action at page 4 relies on Roth at col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 6 in rejecting claim 38. Even assuming (without admitting) that the cited passage of Roth may appropriately be analogized to features related to a converter module for selecting the animated image, wherein the text message from the sender terminal does not specify the animated image, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Roth and Soh is improper for at least the reasons discussed below.

As discussed at pages 10-11 of Applicants’ “Amendment” filed November 18, 2008, Soh at col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 31 and Figure 4 (step S2) describes an originating mobile station transmitting an index to a short message service center (SMC) for purposes of selecting the subject matter of an MMS message from a database stored in the SMC. As such, one skilled in the art, starting from Soh, would not have had an apparent reason to modify Soh to preclude the transmission of the index from the originating mobile station to the SMC, as doing so would have rendered the multimedia event transmission from the SMC to the recipient mobile station inoperative. Thus, claim 38 is further allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: March 26, 2009

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001
GDF/MEW:lab